

Economic Progress of Rural Nonfarm and Part-Time Farm Families

RUTH E. DEACON

JANET A. KROFTA

OHIO AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
WOOSTER, OHIO

CONTENTS

* * * *

Acknowledgments.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Procedure.....	3
Terms Used and Comparisons Made	4
Characteristics of the Sample.....	9
Results.....	10
Changes in Net Worth and Money Income in 1961 Related to Selected Characteristics.....	10
Regression Analyses.....	14
Husbands' and Wives' Goal Selections.....	15
Situational Responses.....	17
Family Evaluation of Factors Influencing Progress.....	18
Summary.....	19
Implications and Discussion.....	20
Appendix—Comparison of Full-Time Farm, Part-Time Farm, and Rural Nonfarm Families.....	21
Literature Cited.....	30

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The cooperation of the 103 families who provided the information which made this study possible is particularly appreciated. For professional advice and consultation at various stages of the study, appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Christine Newark and Dr. Francille Maloch, Department of Home Economics, and Dr. C. Richard Weaver, Statistician, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center.

Economic Progress of Rural Nonfarm and Part-Time Farm Families

RUTH E. DEACON¹ and JANET A. KROFTA²

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this investigation was to relate certain family financial circumstances to the economic progress since marriage of a group of part-time farm and rural nonfarm families. Procedures were developed in a previous study of full-time farm families in Ohio.³

This study provides a basis for comparing the economic progress of families living in a rural setting but engaged in part-time farm and/or nonfarm occupations. Part-time farming, viewed by some as a transitional step between farming and nonfarm employment, has been increasing in Ohio for at least two decades.

The emerging pattern of nonfarm population interspersed with farms in the open country comes from the movement of urban residents to rural areas and the rapid reduction in families engaged in farming. Although farm population decreased sharply in the last decade due to changes in agriculture, the rural population of Ohio increased by 9.4 percent between 1950 and 1960.⁴

PROCEDURE

Fairfield and Licking Counties were selected as representative of the variety of rural situations found in Ohio. The two counties are part of the rural fringe around the Columbus metropolitan area. Both counties are characterized as open country, with professional or industrial employment opportunities within the county or reasonable commuting distance.

Besides residence in the open country, the qualifications for eligible families were established as follows:

1. Husband and wife present in household.
2. Husband not retired.
3. Marriage period from 10 to 39 years.

¹Professor, Department of Home Economics, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center.

²On special appointment with the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center. Previously affiliated with the North Central Regional Research Project, NC-32, Factors Affecting the Financial Security of Rural Families, as a graduate assistant (Wisconsin).

³Deacon, Ruth E. 1962. The Economic Progress Since Marriage of Ohio Families Farming Full-Time in 1958. Ohio Agri. Exp. Sta. Res. Bull. 902. (Ohio Contributing Project, NC-32).

⁴Andrews, Wade H. 1961. 1960 Changes in Population and Agriculture in Ohio and Their Implications. Ohio Agri. Exp. Sta. Res. Circ. 104.

4. For part-time farm families:

- a) Husband employed off the farm 100 days or more.
- b) Sale of \$50 worth of produce from operation of 10 or more acres or sales worth \$250 if less than 10 acres are operated.⁵

Eighty sample areas were drawn in the two counties. The plan was to contact all eligible families in the sample area. Due to problems in obtaining and retaining capable interviewers, contacts were completed in only 50 sample areas.

Interviews were held in the summer and fall of 1962 and were completed with 103 families—59 part-time farm and 44 nonfarm. Approximately two out of every three eligible families did not wish to participate in the study.

The study's purpose and confidential nature were fully explained to eligible families. To obtain as accurate information as possible, interviews were scheduled when both the husband and wife were available to answer the questions. Presence of both the husband and wife served as an internal check to minimize, although not eliminate, response error.⁶

Each interview took from 2 to 2½ hours. The need to recall or estimate economic values in the absence of records accounted for the interview length.

Simple correlation and regression analyses were utilized in the study of data collected.

TERMS USED AND COMPARISONS MADE

Annual Change in Net Worth

Annual change in net worth since marriage, expressed in 1961 dollars, provided the major basis for analysis of ability to get ahead in relation to various family situations and financial circumstances. Total change in net worth since marriage was divided by the number of years of marriage to obtain the average annual change in net worth. This was considered a better basis for comparison than net worth in 1961 or total change in net worth since marriage.

The value of assets and liabilities was obtained for the husband and wife at marriage and for the family at the end of 1961. For assets, values were placed on farm land and buildings, nonfarm real estate, farm machinery and equipment, livestock, feed, farm products and supplies, automobiles, household equipment and furnishings, cash and

⁵Definition of farm, 1960 Census of Population, Volume 1.

⁶Lansing, John B., Gerald P. Ginsburg, and Kaisa Braaten. 1958. An Investigation of Response Error. The Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Illinois, Urbana.

checking accounts, cash value of life insurance,⁷ savings accounts, bonds, stocks, accounts receivable, and other assets such as personal items and retirement annuities. For debts, values were obtained for farm land and buildings; other real estate; farm machinery and equipment; and other debts for farm operation, automobiles, household equipment and furnishings, amounts owed on account, etc.

Net worth information for the year of marriage was adjusted to 1961 dollar values by use of the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.⁸

Family and Financial Situations

Information was obtained on these items for 1961: husband's age, education of husband and wife, family size and composition, ownership and size of farm operation, money income, life insurance, and fixed payments in 1961.

For the years from marriage to 1961, information was sought on the impact of major financial situations which occurred.⁹ Costs were reported for situations involving \$100 or more so that special rather than regular items would be represented in the totals. To help the families recall their financial experiences, the years covered by the study were divided into six periods: pre-depression years (1920's), depression years (1930-35), pre-World War II years (1936-40), World War II years (1941-45), post-World War II years (1946-49), Korean War years to 1961 (1950-61).

For each type of expense or loss covered, the purpose was to find out whether the financial outlay limited or facilitated the rate of getting ahead.

Net Loss or Damage to Property

Net property losses due to accidents, thefts, fires, flood, disease, and other catastrophes were obtained. Benefits received to cover losses were subtracted from total losses to obtain net loss. It was necessary to use the net figure since many families did not know the extent of total loss when benefits were paid directly by the insurance company.

⁷When cash surrender values of life insurance could not be obtained directly, an estimate was derived from information on type of policy, face value, length of time in force, and age of person covered. Cash surrender values were omitted in the net worth reported for full-time farm families in the 1958 study. However, later calculations including life insurance estimates in the net worth totals indicated no significant difference in results.

⁸The Consumer Price Index was used for these comparisons rather than the Index of Wholesale Prices used in the 1958 study of families farming full time. In this study, retail rather than business activities were of major importance.

⁹Although it seemed probable that the total in terms of actual dollars would reflect the effect on families' finances, corrections to constant dollars were also made to check this assumption. The differences were not significant and results are presented in terms of actual dollars.

Net Expenses for Illnesses or Accidents

Major health, accident, or death expenses were included in this category. Excluded were regular or normal expenses of family living, such as dental visits and expenses related to the birth of children. The net cost above insurance was used, the same procedure followed in determining property losses.

Financial Advantages Provided to Family and Others

This general area covered special funds allocated for altruistic or family development purposes. Sub-groupings included gifts and contributions outside the family, advantages provided children, and special family opportunities.

Since regular donations of less than \$100 to a church or any single organization were omitted, special gifts and contributions outside the family did not express fully the extent of giving over the years.

Gifts or Inheritances Received

Cooperating families were asked to value inheritances, gifts, or other financial advantages received over the years. A value was not placed on housing or food received while living with other family members, since benefits received could be balanced by contributions made.

Real Estate Improvements

Outlays were obtained for housing and other major real estate improvements. The main criterion was to reflect additions and not just maintenance of existing facilities.

Annual Investments in Major Household Appliances

The total annual investment in eight major appliances was calculated in terms of the number of years each item had been owned at the time of the interview, rather than expected years of use. This total was used to reflect the family's relative emphasis on household equipment.

Money Income, Fixed Payments, and Life Insurance in 1961

Information was obtained on each family's money income, fixed commitments, and life insurance coverage for 1961. Both husband's and wife's incomes from employment, business, and other sources were included. Net money income was defined as gross money income less current business operation expenses to represent the amount available for family living, paying debts, paying income taxes, and making capital improvements or other investments and savings.

Total fixed payments for the year 1961 included three sub-groupings: debts, including both principal and interest; life insurance coverage; and other fixed payments such as health, property and other insurance protection, property taxes, and rent.

Level of Living and Social Position Indexes

Level of living was measured on Danley and Ramsey's 9-item and 13-item scales.¹⁰ These scales measured material style of life by possession of selected items. The Hollingshead Index of Social Position, which takes into account both education and occupation, was applied to all families.¹¹

Husbands' and Wives' Goal Selections

Each of nine goal statements was paired with the other eight goals and the resulting 36 pairs were listed in random order.¹² Husbands and wives were given separate questionnaires and asked to select which goal in each pair had most influenced their financial management over the years. The nine goal statements were:

1. Debt control—to get or stay out of debt.
2. Efficiency in living conditions—functional, convenient, and comfortable housing, facilities, and equipment.
3. Pleasant surroundings—beauty and attractiveness in clothing, furnishings, buildings, and grounds.
4. Financial security—be able to meet emergency expenses or reduced income.
5. Children's advancement—provide special advantages such as education, start on their own, trips, care, etc.
6. Recreation—enjoyment from sports, socializing, hobbies, etc.
7. Family advancement—continue your own development as well as your children's: educational meetings or courses, books, music, travel, etc.
8. To do and have the things that count toward good community standing.
9. To support community programs and give help to persons who need it.

Simple correlation coefficients were calculated to analyze husband-wife agreement and relationship of the nine goal statements to their family and financial situations.

Situational Responses

Husbands and wives were asked to respond individually to three financial situations.

¹⁰Danley, Robert A. and Charles E. Ramsey. 1959. Standardization and Application of a Level-of-Living Scale for Farm and Nonfarm Families. Cornell Univ. Agri. Exp. Sta. Memoir 362.

¹¹Hollingshead, August B. 1957. Two Factor Index of Social Position. 1965 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. Part-time farm families were classified by their farming rather than nonfarm occupation, upon recommendation of Dr. Hollingshead through correspondence.

¹²Statements used with full-time farm families but omitted in this phase were on building up the farm business and health. Health nearly always ranked first and was considered non-discriminating. Building up the farm business was not applicable to all families in this phase.

The first situation dealt with a potential emergency. They were asked to check on a 6-point scale the amount of concern (from none to very much) they would feel about their ability to meet a special emergency situation (illness, property loss, or job loss) that would take 6 months' income.

The other two situations were hypothetical. One asked whether a couple was in a position to buy a house and, if so, the maximum amount they should borrow. The house seemed to meet the couple's needs and was reasonably priced at \$15,000. The couple's income was \$6,000 and they had average prospects for the future. Their assets in the bank, government bonds, and life insurance were valued at about \$3,000. They still owed \$800 on their car. The purpose here was to test whether those persons expressing high concern in an emergency situation would be more cautious in their outlook on debt.

The other hypothetical question posed a choice between two occupations providing about the same total income over a lifetime. The income from one occupation would vary a great deal from year to year and income from the other would be regular and dependable. Both occupations were liked but the one with the irregular income provided more independence. It carried the possibility of a higher income with good management and a few breaks. The purpose of this question was to test whether persons expressing a high degree of concern about an emergency situation would be more likely to prefer the regular income.

Family Evaluation of Factors Influencing Progress

Husbands and wives were asked what factor had the greatest influence on their financial accomplishments since marriage. Their responses were classified according to:

1. Family or individual characteristics such as husband and wife working together, family cooperation, hard work, ambition, sense of duty.
2. Influence of goals, particularly to achieve better living for the family or to get or stay out of debt.
3. Financial circumstances, such as a good steady job and income, economic conditions, availability and use of credit—the latter mentioned only by part-time farm families.
4. Management procedures, including planning, saving, living within income, buying a home as soon as possible, doing own repairs.
5. Fortuitous circumstances, particularly good health, but also including such replies as luck, God, faith.
6. Limiting conditions such as illness, economic conditions, and "experience the hard way".

TABLE 1.—Assets, Debts, and Net Worth at Marriage and in 1961 in Relation to Annual Change in Net Worth for Part-Time Farm and Nonfarm Families.

Item	Part-Time Farm		Nonfarm	
	Mean	Correlation coefficient†	Mean	Correlation coefficient‡
Assets at marriage, adjusted to 1961 dollars	\$ 5,215	-.41**	\$ 2,781	.11
Assets, end of 1961	33,142	.59**	28,884	.93**
Debts at marriage, adjusted to 1961 dollars	1,340	.49**	123	.35
Debts, end of 1961	6,795	-.08	4,202	-.17
Net worth at marriage, adjusted to 1961 dollars	3,874	-.66**	2,658	.08
Net worth, end of 1961	26,346	.68**	24,682	.93**
Annual change in net worth, 1961 dollars	1,213	—	1,113	—

†Significance level at .05(*) = .28, at .01(**) = .36

‡Significance level at .05(*) = .43, at .01(**) = .55

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

The 103 part-time farm and nonfarm families in this study increased net worth at an annual rate of \$1,170. The rate for the part-time farm families, \$1,213, was only \$100 a year higher than for the nonfarm families (Table 1). Wider range in annual net change was found in the part-time farm families, from —\$540 to \$5,836. The range among the nonfarm families was —\$46 to \$3,011.

The nonfarm and part-time farm family groups had a number of similarities:

Item	Part-Time	Nonfarm
Years of marriage	20.2	19.3
Years of age, husband	44.6	44.2
Number of changes in residence since marriage	4.2	4.3
Years at present residence	10.1	8.6
Percent husbands with farm background only before marriage	56	55
Years of schooling, wife	11.6	11.6
Years of schooling, husband	11.4	12.1

Homes of the families studied were well equipped with modern conveniences. Ninety percent or more of both part-time and nonfarm families' homes had electricity, washing machines, telephones, ranges,

refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, and television. Between 80 and 89 percent had hot and cold running water, bathrooms, central heating, and sewing machines. Between 60 and 79 percent were equipped with freezers or clothes dryers. However, less than 10 percent had mechanical food waste disposers, dishwashers, or air conditioners.

RESULTS¹³

CHANGE IN NET WORTH AND MONEY INCOME IN 1961 RELATED TO SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Simple correlation coefficients were used to indicate the relationship of all factors to annual change in net worth since marriage.¹⁴ Regression analyses were used to determine the relative effect of significant factors on annual change in net worth. The relation of selected factors to total money income was also compared.

Net Worth at Marriage, in 1961, and Annual Change Since Marriage

Assets at marriage were negatively correlated** with annual change in net worth among part-time farm families. Lower assets at marriage were associated with higher rates of increase in net worth or vice versa (Table 1). Part-time farm families generally started marriage with more assets than the nonfarm families. Assets at the end of 1961 were positively correlated** with annual change in net worth for both part-time farm and nonfarm families.

Debts at marriage were positively correlated** with the annual change in net worth of the part-time farm families. However, debts for nonfarm families at marriage and for both groups in 1961 were not significantly correlated.

Net worth at marriage was negatively associated** with rate of change in net worth of part-time farm families.

Net worth in 1961 was positively correlated** with annual change in net worth. It evidently was a good indication of rate of change for both groups of families, but particularly nonfarm families.

Children

The average number of children did not correlate significantly with annual change in net worth (Table 2). Large families evidently did not help or limit the rate of economic progress. However, total years of high school completed by all children correlated significantly with annual change in net worth of nonfarm families. Total years beyond

¹³All correlations reported significant in this study are at the 5 percent level unless indicated significant at the 1 percent level (**).

¹⁴Since the correlation of annual change in net worth with years of marriage was not significant in the regression, this factor was not considered to be a major one in determining annual change in net worth for families married more than 10 years.

TABLE 2.—Number of Children in Relation to Annual Change in Net Worth for Part-Time Farm and Nonfarm Families.

Item	Part-Time Farm		Nonfarm	
	Mean	Correlation coefficient†	Mean	Correlation coefficient‡
Number of children	2.8	-.16	2.5	-.05
Total years high school completed, children	3.7	-.22	3.5	.49*
Total years beyond high school completed, children	.7	-.24	.5	.25

†Significance level at .05(*) = .28, at .01(**) = .36

‡Significance level at .05(*) = .43, at .01(**) = .55

high school completed by children was not related to rate of change in net worth.

Employment

The significant, negative correlation between the number of jobs held by the husband since marriage and the annual change in net worth of nonfarm families indicated that increased frequency of job changes was associated with decreased economic progress of the family (Table 3). Wives' employment, measured in years, was not a significant factor in relation to annual change in net worth for either group. The time in months that husbands were disabled or unemployed also was not significant.

TABLE 3.—Employment in Relation to Annual Change in Net Worth for Part-Time Farm and Nonfarm Families.

Item	Part-Time Farm		Nonfarm	
	Mean	Correlation coefficient†	Mean	Correlation coefficient‡
Number different places husband employed	4.3	.06	3.0	-.47*
Months husband lost work due to:				
disability	0.8	-.05	3.5	-.30
unemployment	2.2	-.16	1.8	-.08
Years wife employed	5.0	-.07	5.4	.05

†Significance level at .05(*) = .28, at .01(**) = .36

‡Significance level at .05(*) = .43, at .01(**) = .55

Financial Losses, Expenses, and Receipts Since Marriage

Neither losses from damage to property nor net expenses from illnesses and accidents were significantly associated with annual change in net worth (Table 4). Apparently families were able to absorb these costs as they occurred. Average losses from damage to property were similar for the part-time farm and nonfarm families. Net expenses from illnesses and accidents were somewhat higher for the part-time farm families.

Financial advantages provided to children over the years were twice as high for nonfarm as for part-time farm families and correlated significantly** with annual change in net worth of nonfarm families. The mean values of special opportunities provided the family were similar for part-time farm and nonfarm families.

Gifts and contributions outside the family were positively associated** with annual change in net worth of nonfarm families. The

TABLE 4.—Financial Losses, Expenses, and Receipts Since Marriage in Relation to Annual Change in Net Worth of Part-Time Farm and Nonfarm Families.

Item	Part-Time Farm		Nonfarm	
	Mean†	Correlation coefficient‡	Mean†	Correlation coefficient††
Net loss from damage to property	\$ 482	.14	\$ 471	-.13
Net expenses for illnesses, accidents	693	.00	510	.01
Financial advantages provided children	653	-.04	1,219	.60**
Special opportunities provided family	612	.02	638	.08
Gifts and contributions outside family	1,129	.32*	1,237	.63**
Gifts and inheritances received	2,291	.19	973	.13
Major real estate improvements	6,181	-.03	4,206	.48*
Annual investment in major appliances	277	.20	296	.14

†Mean losses are reported as actual dollars; differences were not significant when losses in actual dollars were compared to losses adjusted to 1961 dollars. The means are presented as approximations, since the question asked only for amounts above \$100 and since problems with recall are recognized. Comparisons between the nonfarm and part-time farm family groups are of major interest.

‡Significance level at .05(*) = .28, at .01(**) = .36

††Significance level at .05(*) = .43, at .01(**) = .55

means were similar for both groups. Mean value of gifts or inheritances received was higher for the part-time farm families than for the nonfarm families.

Value of major real estate improvements for nonfarm families was significantly associated with annual change in net worth. Although the mean value of real estate improvements by part-time farm families was higher than for nonfarm families, the correlation to change in net worth was not significant. Mean annual investment in eight major appliances was similar for both groups of families. In both groups, the relation of annual investment in appliances to annual change in net worth was not significant.

Money Income, Fixed Payments, and Life Insurance Face Value in 1961

The correlation of total money income to annual change in net worth of both groups of families was significant (**part-time farm families).

The husband's employment provided more than 80 percent of the mean family income for both groups** (Table 5). Other sources of

TABLE 5.—Insurance, Fixed Payments, and Income Components in 1961 in Relation to Total Money Income of Part-Time Farm and Nonfarm Families.

Item	Part-Time Farm		Nonfarm	
	Mean	Correlation coefficient†	Mean	Correlation coefficient‡
Total money income	\$6,357	—	\$6,806	—
Income from husband's employment	5,201	.76**	5,849	.69**
Income from wife's employment	274	.03	791	.47**
Income from other sources	210	.40**	154	-.10
Net income from farming	672	.38**	32	.20
Total fixed payments	1,899	.19	1,651	.20
Annual life insurance payment	193	.17	196	-.06
Annual payment on debts	1,038	.15	834	.17
Other fixed payments	682	.27*	607	.14
Face value of life insurance on husband	9,468	.36**	9,934	.11
Face value of life insurance on wife	506	-.13	1,042	.22
Face value of life insurance on children	1,439	-.04	2,101	.18

†Significance level at .05(*) = .26, at .01(**) = .34

‡Significance level at .05(*) = .30, at .01(**) = .39

income, except the wife's outside employment, were significant** for part-time farm families. However, the wife's contribution to farming probably was important. Income from outside employment of the wife was significant** for nonfarm families.

Total fixed payments were not correlated significantly with total money income in 1961 for either part-time farm or nonfarm families. However, fixed payments other than on debts and life insurance were significant for part-time farm families. Total fixed payments amounted to 30 percent of money income of part-time farm families and 24 percent of money income of nonfarm families. Debt payments were half or more of the total fixed payments for each group of families.

The mean face value of life insurance carried on the husband's life was nearly \$10,000 for both nonfarm and part-time farm families. The relation to total money income was significant** for part-time farm families only. Lower face values of life insurance were carried on the wife than on the children in both groups, although the amounts were higher in both cases for nonfarm families.

Level of Living and Social Position

Neither the 13- or 9-item Danley and Ramsey level of living scales correlated significantly with annual change in net worth.¹⁵

On the Hollingshead Index of Social Position, based on occupation and education, the part-time farm families ranked somewhat higher than the nonfarm families. High social position according to the Hollingshead Index was associated with high annual change in net worth** for both the nonfarm and the part-time farm groups.

REGRESSION ANALYSES

Eight variables which correlated significantly with annual change in net worth for part-time and nonfarm families and which had implications for influencing change over time were included in regression analyses of the total sample. Another factor included in this test was the relative annual change in net worth of nonfarm over part-time farm families.

$$Y = 310.7534 + (6.4682)X_1 + (-2.3574)X_2 + (-1.2284)X_3 \\ + (.1518)X_4 + (-3.2117)X_5 + (-.0413)X_6 \\ + (.0080)X_7 + (.0891)X_8 + (.0395)X_9$$

Y = change in net worth

X₁ = nonfarm change in net worth relative to part-time

X₂ = years of marriage

X₃ = years of high school completed by children

¹⁵Danley, Robert A. and Charles E. Ramsey, op. cit.

- X_4 = number of different places employed
- X_5 = Hollingshead Index of Social Position
- X_6 = net worth at marriage, 1961 dollars
- X_7 = major real estate improvements, 1961 dollars
- X_8 = advantages provided children, 1961 dollars
- X_9 = gifts and contributions outside family, 1961 dollars

Statistically significant variables were the Hollingshead Index of Social Position, net worth at marriage, and advantages provided children. Since the Hollingshead Index is influenced by both educational and financial factors, this strong relationship was to be expected. It is of particular interest that annual change in net worth of nonfarm families relative to part-time farm families and years of marriage were non-significant.

The effect of net worth at marriage was negative. Families with higher net worth at marriage made smaller annual gains than families with lower net worth. So possession of resources at marriage is not necessarily an advantage; lower net worth at marriage might be a motivation toward greater gains.

The paramount position that provision for children assumes in the total family financial picture is apparent, since other financial factors were nonsignificant in the regression analyses.

HUSBANDS' AND WIVES' GOAL SELECTIONS

Husband-Wife Agreement

Husbands' and wives' selections among nine goal statements were significantly correlated for four goals: children's advancement**, debt control, family advancement, and community standing.¹⁶

Ranking of Goal Statements

Goal statements of homemakers were ranked and selected factors related to goals were studied. Ranking was based on the total score for each goal. Both nonfarm and part-time farm homemakers placed the same goals into each third of the ranking. However, nonfarm homemakers placed more importance on family development and less on children's welfare than part-time farm women.¹⁷

Correlation of Goal Selections and Family Situations

Certain circumstances correlated significantly to preferences among goal statements (Appendix, Tables 10-13). Beginning with the highest ranked goal statements, these were:

¹⁶Heinzerling, Barbara M. 1963. Goal Statements and Their Relation to Selected Characteristics of Rural Families in Ohio. Unpublished Master's thesis, The Ohio State University.

¹⁷Ibid.

Financial Security: Financial security ranked high as a family goal, even though it was not related significantly to most of the specific financial circumstances studied. Its preference by part-time farm husbands was related to debts**, debt payment, other fixed payments, and total fixed payments in 1961. Emphasis on the goal of financial security by nonfarm wives was associated negatively with the amount spent for special family opportunities since marriage. Annual change in net worth was not related significantly to the goal of financial security.

Family Advancement: Part-time farm wives' selection of the goal of family advancement related negatively to years of marriage but related directly** to the annual investment by the family in major appliances. Only the part-time farm husbands' emphasis on family advancement correlated significantly to the amount spent for special family opportunities.

Debt Control: Although debt control ranked third as a goal preference, there was no clear pattern of its relationship to other financial circumstances. Selection of debt control as a goal by part-time farm husbands related significantly to the amount spent on major real estate improvements. Its selection by nonfarm wives related negatively to the amount spent for special family opportunities and to the face value of life insurance on the wife. The amount of debt or rate of repayment was not related significantly to the importance these couples attached to debt control as a family goal.

Children's Advancement: Emphasis on the goal of children's advancement by nonfarm wives** and part-time farm husbands related directly to the number of children. For the part-time farm husbands, it also related to the amount spent providing advantages for children, the 1961 life insurance payment, and the face value of life insurance on all family members. However, none of these relationships was significant for nonfarm husbands or either group of wives.

Emphasis by part-time farm wives on the goal of children's advancement correlated positively** with annual investment in major appliances and correlated negatively** with years of marriage. Apparently those married the longest were beyond the stage of major concern for children's advancement.

Convenient Housing: Although efficiency in living conditions was important to these families, the emphasis placed on this goal did not correlate significantly with specific family financial situations such as amounts spent for major appliances or real estate improvements. Desire for efficient living conditions by nonfarm wives correlated with the face value of life insurance on the wife. Emphasis on this goal by nonfarm husbands related negatively to face value of life insurance on the husband.

Community Support: Among part-time farm husbands, emphasis on the goal of supporting community programs was associated positively with years of marriage and associated negatively with debts in 1961 and face value of husband's life insurance. Among nonfarm husbands, community support was associated with face value of life insurance on the wife. Only part-time farm wives' emphasis on community support was found to be related to the amount spent for gifts outside the family.

Community Standing: Emphasis on good community standing by part-time farm wives was related** to years of marriage. Among nonfarm wives, this goal correlated with face value of life insurance on children. Part-time farm husbands' emphasis on good community standing, however, related inversely to amounts spent for life insurance in 1961, value of gifts given outside the family, and face value of husband's life insurance. Nonfarm husbands' interest in good community standing correlated negatively with total money income in 1961. There was no indication that these families interpreted community standing in terms of visible evidence of "keeping up with the Joneses" by investment in appliances or real estate improvements.

Pleasant Surroundings: Beauty and attractiveness in clothing, furnishings, and surroundings were generally less important to these families than the above goals. Selection of this goal by nonfarm wives correlated** with other fixed payments. Its selection by part-time farm wives related negatively to the face value of children's life insurance. Nonfarm husbands' selection of this goal related negatively to the value of gifts given outside the family.

Recreation: Recreation was accorded least importance among the nine goal statements. Its choice by part-time farm husbands was associated negatively with annual change in net worth.

Relationship of financial situations to some goal selections were ones which might be expected. However, the lack of relationship to other goals suggested that family goals often were independent of particular financial experiences.

SITUATIONAL RESPONSES

In reply to the question about the degree of concern they would feel if an emergency situation arose that would take 6 months' income, 65 percent of all 191 respondents indicated they would feel very much concern. Slightly more wives, 70 percent compared to 60 percent of the husbands, thought they would be very much concerned. Another 15 percent of all respondents indicated they would be much concerned, while 14 percent said they would feel some concern. Only 6 percent re-

plied that they would have little, very little, or no concern if an emergency should take 6 months of their income.

Differences in the degree of concern for the loss of 6 months' income were not reflected in responses to the hypothetical question whether a couple was in a position to buy a house. The couple was considered to be financially able to buy the house by 67 percent of all respondents. Of the 122 suggesting a maximum amount to borrow, 20 percent suggested \$6,000 or less, 69 percent suggested from \$6,001 to \$12,000 and 11 percent suggested the couple could borrow more than \$12,000. These answers were distributed proportionally among the expressed degrees of concern about the respondents' own situations.

Preferences for an occupation with a regular, rather than an irregular, income were also distributed proportionally to expressed degrees of concern about loss of 6 months' income. The regular income was preferred by 78 percent of all respondents, 71 percent of the husbands, and 85 percent of the wives.

FAMILY EVALUATION OF FACTORS INFLUENCING PROGRESS

All husbands and nearly all wives gave positive responses to the question on what factor had influenced their financial accomplishments since marriage. Different points made by the couples, many of whom gave two or more, were:

	Part-Time Farm Couples	Nonfarm Couples
Family or individual characteristics	54	49
Management procedures	35	32
Fortuitous circumstances	17	9
Financial circumstances	33	15
Influence of goals	13	8
Limiting conditions	—	6
Total points made	142	119
Number of persons replying	104	77

Part-time farm families made relatively more mention of the impact of financial and fortuitous circumstances. Nonfarm families mentioned individual and family characteristics, management procedures, and limiting conditions more often.

SUMMARY

The relation of selected family and financial circumstances to economic progress since marriage was investigated for a group of central Ohio rural nonfarm and part-time farm families. A similar study was made earlier with a group of full-time farm families in nearby central Ohio counties.

Husbands and wives of 59 part-time farm and 44 nonfarm families in Fairfield and Licking counties were interviewed in the summer of 1962. Eligibility factors were: husband and wife in the household, husband not retired, marriage period from 10 to 39 years, and for part-time farmers, husband employed off the farm (census definition) 100 days or more in 1961.

Comparisons of selected family and financial circumstances were made to the mean annual change in net worth since marriage. The circumstances included family size, employment, and education; losses, expenses, and receipts throughout marriage; net worth factors at marriage and in 1961; life insurance carried in 1961; fixed payments in 1961; money income in 1961; and husbands' and wives' goal preferences. Some of these circumstances were also compared to 1961 money income.

Differences in the annual increase in net worth for part-time and nonfarm families were nonsignificant. The mean annual change for these two groups was \$1,213 and \$1,113, respectively.

Among part-time farm families, annual change in net worth correlated significantly with assets in the year married (negative), assets at the end of 1961, debts in the year married, net worth in the year married (negative), net worth at the end of 1961, gifts and contributions outside the family, total money income in 1961, and social position as measured by the Hollingshead Index of Social Position.

Among rural nonfarm families, annual change in net worth correlated significantly with assets at the end of 1961, net worth at the end of 1961, total years of high school completed by children, number of jobs held by the husband (negative), financial advantages provided children, gifts and contributions outside the family, major real estate improvements, total money income in 1961, and social position as measured by the Hollingshead Index of Social Position.

The regression analyses included both the nonfarm and part-time farm families, with annual change in net worth as the dependent variable. Total years of marriage was a nonsignificant factor. Significant factors were the Hollingshead Index of Social Position, net worth at marriage, and advantages provided to children since marriage.

Income from husband's employment, income from farming, and income from other sources were significant contributors to total 1961 money income of the part-time farm families. For nonfarm families, income from husband's employment and income from wife's employment were the significant sources. Mean money income in 1961 was \$6,357 for the part-time farm families and \$6,806 for the nonfarm families.

Husbands' and wives' goal selections correlated significantly with family advancement, debt control, children's advancement, and community standing. Although significant correlations between some goal preferences and some family and financial circumstances were reasonable, the absence of other expected relationships suggested that goal preferences often were independent of specific experiences. According to homemakers' rankings of the nine goals, the three most important were: financial security, family advancement, and children's advancement.

IMPLICATIONS AND DISCUSSION

Among the situations studied, the financial conditions at marriage and at the time of the interview—debts, assets, income, occupation and education (social position)—had significance for the annual change in net worth. A number of factors designed to reflect the impact of major financial situations for the intervening years had a positive relation—financial advantages provided children, gifts and contributions outside the family, major real estate improvements, and years of high school completed by children. These were situations which had an element of choice for which resources were adequate. The only factor which had a negative relation to annual change in net worth was the number of places the nonfarm husband had been employed since marriage.

Although findings from this study suggest that families were generally able to meet risks or demands without long-run financial impacts, the results might be affected by:

1. Inadequate recall of the financial demands of the situation.
2. Similarity in or lack of special experiences of families willing to be interviewed.
3. Inadequate definition or detail about the significant circumstances and how they were met.
4. Inadequate plan for analysis of interrelationships.

Other methods of data collection and analysis might reveal interrelationships not apparent in this overview. For example, more detailed information and analysis of how emergency and other situations involving risk and loss are handled effectively could help identify the conditions which minimize their effects.

Questions arise whether net worth has any advantage over other definitions of savings in a search for significant influences and whether longitudinal approaches or evidences of long-run effects are pertinent. Because the net worth concept has implications for the total financial position, it seems to provide a broader reflection of families' economic welfare than assets alone.

Relative to the longitudinal approach, available net worth information in terms of estimated average annual changes consistently suggests higher annual savings than are recorded by surveys of consumer income and expenditures.¹⁵ Estimates of annual change in net worth and annual surveys of the average net change in assets and liabilities indicate that a difference of \$600-700 appears conservative.

What is the explanation for this gap which is unlikely to be closed by a resolution of differences in the recording of gifts and durable items or appreciation in property values? How do household production and methods of meeting financial needs relate? Influences on these long-run changes in net worth merit further investigation to clarify the kinds of financial procedures which make real differences.

APPENDIX

COMPARISON OF FULL-TIME FARM, PART-TIME FARM AND RURAL NONFARM FAMILIES

Family and Financial Situations

Data from a recent study of full-time farm families¹⁶ and this study of part-time and nonfarm families provide comparative profiles of economic progress of rural Ohio families.

The full-time farm families, interviewed in 1959, were required to have farming operations of 120 to 500 acres and land ownership at a

¹⁵Survey of Financial Characteristics of Consumers. Fed. Reserve Bull. March 1964. pp. 285-293.

1960-61 Survey of Consumer Expenditures and Income. Bur. of Labor Statistics Report No. 237-90, 93 (U. S. Dept. Agr. Rep. CES-12, 15). February and May 1965.

The annual change in net worth of \$1170 for the rural families of this study may be compared to the families of the Federal Reserve report where heads from 35 to 44 years of age had an average net worth at the end of 1962 of approximately \$20,000. If the heads at mid-point of the age range had been married at age 22 and had \$2,000 at marriage, their average annual change in net worth would have been about \$1,000.

The 1960-61 Survey of Consumer Expenditures provides information about annual savings, using the net worth concept of net change in assets and liabilities. The net annual change in assets and liabilities for all families in the United States was \$199—\$177 for urban, \$176 for rural nonfarm, and \$519 for rural farm families. For families in the North Central Region, net annual change in assets and liabilities averaged \$353—\$326 for urban, \$295 for rural nonfarm, and \$709 for rural farm families.

¹⁶Deacon, Ruth E. op cit.

TABLE 6.—Family and Financial Situations of Full-Time Farm, Part-Time Farm, and Nonfarm Families.

Family and Financial Situations	Full-Time Farm	Part-Time Farm	Nonfarm
Net worth at marriage	\$ 7,318†	\$ 3,874‡	\$ 2,658‡
Net worth, 1958 or 1961	67,873	26,346	24,682
Annual change in net worth	2,948	1,213	1,113
		Mean values	
Age of husband, years	47.7	44.6	44.2
Years of marriage	21.6	20.2	19.3
Years of school completed, husbands	11.6	11.4	12.1
Number of children	2.8	2.8	2.5
Total years high school completed by children	5.3	3.7	3.5
Total years beyond high school completed by children	1.6	.7	.5
Years at present residence	15.1	10.1	8.6
Acres operated	236	85	—

†Adjusted to 1958 dollars, Index of Wholesale Prices

‡Adjusted to 1961 dollars, Consumer Price Index

minimum of 80 acres.²⁰ Off-farm work by the operator was limited to less than 100 days per year.

Rural residence, marriage period from 10 to 39 years, husband and wife present in household, and husband not retired were requirements of all families interviewed in both studies. Interview schedules were identical in all relevant parts. For the full-time farm families, only the wives were asked to complete the goal questionnaire and at a later time. The full-time farm sample consisted of 103 families; the part-time farm sample, 59 families; and the rural nonfarm sample, 44 families.

Among the three groups, nonfarm and part-time farm families were more similar to each other than to the full-time farm families. Full-time farm families changed their net worth at a mean annual rate of \$2,948, more than twice that of either part-time (\$1,213) or nonfarm (\$1,113) families (Table 6).

Assets, debts, and net worth in the year married and the year prior to the interview were largest for the full-time farm families and smallest for the nonfarm families, with those of the part-time families approaching those of the nonfarm families. Almost four-fifths of the full-time farm families changed their net worth at rates in the \$1,000 to \$3,999 range, compared to about half of the families in the other two groups. Only 4 percent of the full-time farm families changed net

²⁰The farms operated by the families were generally above average commercial farms, corresponding to Class III farms which are in the top fifth of all Ohio farms in 1959. U. S. Census of Agriculture: 1959. Volume I, Counties, Part 10, Ohio. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1961.

TABLE 7.—Mean Values of Insurance, Payments, and Income in 1958 or 1961 of Full-Time Farm, Part-Time Farm and Nonfarm Families.

Financial Factors	Full-Time Farm	Part-Time Farm	Nonfarm
Face value of life insurance on husband	\$7,031	\$9,468	\$9,934
Face value of life insurance on wife	973	506	1,042
Face value of life insurance on children	1,541	1,439	2,101
Annual life insurance payment	200	193	196
Annual payment on debts	1,151	1,038	834
Other fixed payments	1,063	682	607
Total fixed payments	2,447	1,899	1,651
Net income from farming	5,219	672	32
Income from husband's primary employment other than farming	—	5,201	5,849
Income from wife's employment	408	274	791
Income from other sources	556	210	154
Total money income	6,183	6,357	6,806

worth at rates less than \$1,000 annually, compared with nearly half of the part-time farm and nonfarm families.

Face value of life insurance on the husband in the last full year covered by the interview was \$2-3,000 higher in the part-time farm and nonfarm groups (Table 7). Nonfarm families had the highest life insurance coverage on husband, wife, and children.

Fixed payments were highest for the full-time farm families. Nevertheless, net money income was \$6,183 for full-time farm families (in 1958) compared to \$6,357 for part-time farm and \$6,806 for nonfarm families (in 1961).

Simple correlations of family and financial factors and annual change in net worth yielded differences in significance among the three groups (Table 8). Years of marriage correlated negatively with annual change in net worth among the full-time farm families and positively among the nonfarm families. It was not significant among part-time farm families. Opportunities for rapid change in net worth may come at different times in the life cycle for farm families than for nonfarm families.

Number of children, gifts and inheritances received, and debts in 1958 correlated strongly with annual change in net worth of the full-time farm families but were not significant for nonfarm or part-time farm families. Assets, net worth, and net money income in 1958 or 1961 correlated significantly with annual change in net worth of all

TABLE 8.—Family and Financial Factors in Relation to Annual Change in Net Worth of Full-Time Farm, Part-Time Farm and Nonfarm Families.[†]

Family and Financial Factors	Full-Time Farm N = 103	Part-Time Farm N = 49	Nonfarm N = 21
Years of marriage	-.24*	.26	.47*
Assets at marriage	—	-.41**	.11
Assets, 1958 or 1961	.86**	.59**	.93**
Debts at marriage	—	.49**	.35
Debts, 1958 or 1961	.31**	-.08	-.17
Net worth at marriage	.04	-.66**	.08
Net worth, 1958 or 1961	.74**	.68**	.93**
Net money income, 1958 or 1961	.60**	.50**	.45*
Major real estate improvements	.36**	-.03	.48*
Gifts or inheritances received	.26**	.18	.12
Number of children	.27**	-.16	-.05
Face value, husband's life insurance	.22*	.16	.25

[†]Significance level when N = 103: .05(*) = .19, .01(**) = .25; N = 49: .05 = .28, .01 = .36; N = 21: .05 = .43, .01 = .55

three groups. Change in net worth for the part-time farm families correlated significantly with assets (negative), net worth (negative), and debts in the year married. Annual change in net worth correlated significantly with major real estate improvements of full-time farm and nonfarm families and face value of husband's life insurance in full-time farm families.

Homemakers, Goal Statements and Their Relation to Selected Characteristics²¹

Goal statements of homemakers in the three groups were analyzed to determine reliability of a pair comparison instrument for ranking goal statements and to study selected factors related to goals. The rankings based on total score for each goal of the 89 full-time farm homemakers who were asked to rank the pairs of goal statements in 1959 and again in 1963 remained the same. Some support was found for the hypothesis that differences existed between the group of homemakers who made many changes in choice of goal statements and those who made few.

Family life cycle comparisons of full-time farm homemakers' goal rankings showed differences in the importance placed on various goals. For example, homemakers with college-age children placed more im-

²¹Heinzerling, Barbara M. op cit.

TABLE 9.—Homemakers' Rank of Goals by Farm Status.

Goal	Full-Time Farm	Part-Time Farm	Nonfarm
Financial security	1	1	2
Children's advancement	2	4	5
Family advancement	3	2	1
Convenient housing	4	5	4
Community support	5	6	6
Debt control	6	3	3
Community standing	7	7	7
Pleasant surroundings	8	8	8
Enjoy life	9	9	9

portance on children's advancement and less on health than the other groups.

When the rankings given by full-time farm, part-time farm, and nonfarm homemakers were compared, all placed approximately the same emphasis on financial security, convenient housing, and community support. The full-time farm group placed less emphasis on debt control than the other groups. The three goals of community standing, pleasant surroundings, and recreation were placed lowest, and in that order, by all three groups (Table 9).

TABLE 10.—Correlations of Goal Selections of Part-Time Farm Husbands with Family and Financial Circumstances.†

Item	Financial Security	Family Advance- ment	Debt Control	Children's Advance- ment	Conven- ient Housing	Commu- nity Support	Commu- nity Standing	Pleasant Surround- ings	Recreation
Years of marriage	-.03	-.13	-.09	-.04	-.16	.29*	.11	.13	.02
Number of children	.04	.24	-.04	.34*	-.12	-.21	-.01	.00	-.18
Annual change in net worth	-.07	-.09	.02	-.17	-.09	-.01	.00	-.19	-.31*
Gifts outside family	.06	.23	-.04	.15	.06	.11	-.30*	-.15	-.09
Annual investment in major appliances	.20	.01	.09	.15	-.00	-.12	-.18	-.14	-.05
Advantages provided children	-.16	.28	-.19	.32*	-.03	-.03	-.10	.01	-.06
Special family opportunities	-.13	.32*	-.07	.27	.02	-.13	-.18	-.02	.04
Major real estate improvements	.00	-.19	.33*	-.22	.04	-.22	-.09	.19	.09
Debts, end of 1961	.37**	-.05	.28	.03	.01	-.33*	-.18	-.01	.09
Payment on debts, 1961	.30*	-.07	.24	.09	-.11	-.19	-.16	.02	.06
Other fixed payments, 1961	.34*	-.03	.11	-.06	.02	-.14	-.28	.01	-.18
Life insurance payment, 1961	.14	.14	-.05	.30*	-.04	-.28	-.34*	-.13	.00
Face value life insurance on husband	.18	.14	.00	.32*	-.13	-.29*	-.33*	-.03	.08
Face value life insurance on wife	.09	.28	-.12	.34*	.02	-.17	-.23	-.01	.05
Face value life insurance on children	.19	.15	-.06	.29*	.01	-.22	-.18	-.06	.02
Total money income, 1961	-.23	-.09	-.02	.04	-.05	-.25	.10	-.08	-.15

†Significance level at .05(*) = .28, at .01(**) = .36

TABLE 11.—Correlations of Goal Selections of Nonfarm Husbands with Family and Financial Circumstances.†

Item	Financial Security	Family Advance- ment	Debt Control	Children's Advance- ment	Conven- ient Housing	Communi- ty Support	Communi- ty Standing	Pleasant Surround- ings	Recreation
Years of marriage	.30	-.39	.27	-.25	.15	.37	.15	-.38	-.34
Number of children	-.24	.17	-.23	.30	-.11	.25	-.39	.06	.15
Annual change in net worth	.41	.00	.04	.01	-.04	.10	-.26	-.13	-.30
Gifts outside family	.12	-.08	.18	.07	.16	.20	-.23	-.46*	-.17
Annual investment in major appliances	.16	-.09	.02	-.09	.28	-.02	-.40	.09	.04
Advantages provided children	.00	-.01	.08	.09	-.05	.35	-.05	-.32	-.29
Special family opportunities	.23	-.01	-.06	.09	-.37	.20	.06	-.19	-.14
Major real estate improvements	.05	-.04	.26	.02	-.13	.23	.08	-.40	-.35
Debts, end of 1961	-.33	.03	.02	.07	-.08	-.18	-.04	.38	.17
Payment on debts, 1961	-.41	.15	.16	.13	-.21	-.16	.02	.23	-.02
Other fixed payments, 1961	.22	-.12	-.09	-.18	-.08	.04	.13	.14	.08
Life insurance payment, 1961	.16	.00	-.02	.11	-.28	-.11	.13	-.14	.00
Face value life insurance on husband	-.03	.27	-.37	.15	-.44*	.01	.03	.39	.06
Face value life insurance on wife	.07	-.18	.06	-.19	-.23	.45*	.03	.03	-.13
Face value life insurance on children	.05	.13	.15	.13	-.14	-.20	-.15	-.10	-.07
Total money income, 1961	.25	.02	.21	.12	.20	.03	-.49*	.22	-.40

†Significance level: at .05(*) = .43, at .01(**) = .55

TABLE 12.—Correlations of Goal Selections of Part-Time Farm Wives with Family and Financial Circumstances.†

Item	Financial Security	Family Advance- ment	Debt Control	Children's Advance- ment	Conven- ient Housing	Commu- nity Support	Commu- nity Standing	Pleasant Surround- ings	Recreation
Years of marriage	-.08	-.29*	.03	-.39**	-.04	.26	.40**	.21	-.13
Number of children	.13	.03	-.05	.20	-.06	.04	.01	-.26	-.13
Annual change in net worth	-.03	.17	-.04	-.09	.04	.03	.04	.06	.09
Gifts outside family	-.27	.06	-.12	.02	-.06	.30*	.01	-.04	.05
Annual investment in major appliances	-.26	.52**	-.16	.39**	-.12	-.11	-.25	-.19	.05
Advantages provided children	-.09	.16	-.20	.19	-.02	-.04	-.05	-.01	.03
Special family opportunities	-.04	.23	-.21	.15	.00	-.10	-.13	-.03	.07
Major real estate improvements	.05	.17	-.27	-.03	-.02	.09	-.03	.17	.00
Debts, end of 1961	-.03	.15	-.04	.18	-.24	.03	-.16	-.02	.11
Payment on debts, 1961	-.16	.10	.05	.07	-.18	.08	-.01	-.12	.07
Other fixed payments, 1961	.10	.05	.15	-.02	-.17	-.01	-.05	-.01	-.07
Life insurance payment, 1961	-.20	.22	-.04	.24	-.08	-.01	-.09	.04	-.16
Face value life insurance on husband	-.04	.18	-.02	.19	-.23	.02	-.19	.03	.02
Face value life insurance on wife	-.13	.11	-.21	.22	-.01	.17	-.01	-.05	-.19
Face value life insurance on children	.00	.09	.11	.16	-.12	-.05	.10	-.32*	-.17
Total money income, 1961	-.07	.23	-.14	.16	.05	-.17	-.13	.01	.09

†Significance level at .05(*) = .28, at .01(**) = .36

TABLE 13.—Correlations of Goal Selections of Nonfarm Wives with Family and Financial Circumstances†

Item	Financial Security	Family Advance- ment	Debt Control	Children's Advance- ment	Conven- ient Housing	Communi- ty Support	Communi- ty Standing	Pleasant Surround- ings	Recreation
Years of marriage	-.04	-.27	-.13	.01	.18	.23	-.33	.24	.11
Number of children	-.04	.26	-.42	.61**	.05	.14	-.39	-.30	.42
Annual change in net worth	-.23	.23	.05	-.12	.17	.04	-.31	.30	.18
Gifts outside family	.08	-.02	-.25	.08	.04	.28	-.13	-.13	.12
Annual investment in major appliances	.04	.04	.10	.12	-.02	-.38	.11	-.05	.04
Advantages provided children	-.03	.15	-.27	.20	-.13	.21	-.25	.13	.10
Special family opportunities	-.44*	.19	-.51*	.02	.27	.15	.26	.11	.36
Major real estate improvements	-.25	.05	-.31	.04	-.09	.35	-.14	.16	.00
Debts, end of 1961	.02	.33	-.08	.32	-.18	-.42	.01	-.09	.20
Payment on debts, 1961	-.24	.27	-.30	.13	-.05	-.20	.40	.06	.11
Other fixed payments, 1961	-.32	-.12	.20	-.12	-.11	-.04	-.10	.57**	.14
Life insurance payment, 1961	-.31	-.09	-.08	-.38	.24	-.11	.05	.32	.31
Face value life insurance on husband	-.28	.39	-.40	.16	.20	-.07	-.34	.17	.55*
Face value life insurance on wife	.04	-.15	-.49*	-.18	.56**	.07	.22	.15	.35
Face value life insurance on children	-.25	.23	-.22	-.19	.22	.11	.53*	-.02	-.17
Total money income, 1961	-.09	.14	-.15	.20	.24	.24	.09	-.14	.19

†Significance level at .05(*) = 43, at .01(**) = 55

LITERATURE CITED

1. Andrews, Wade H. 1961. 1960 Changes in Population and Agriculture in Ohio and Their Implications. Ohio Agri. Exp. Sta. Res. Circ. 104.
2. Danley, Robert A. and Charles E. Ramsey. 1959. Standardization and Application of a Level-of-Living Scale for Farm and Nonfarm Families. Cornell Univ. Agri. Exp. Sta., Ithaca, N.Y. Memoir 362.
3. Deacon, Ruth E. 1962. The Economic Progress Since Marriage of Ohio Families Farming Full-Time in 1958. Ohio Agri. Exp. Sta. Res. Bull. 902.
4. Heinzerling, Barbara M. 1963. Goal Statements and Their Relation to Selected Characteristics of Rural Families in Ohio. Unpublished Master's thesis, The Ohio State University.
5. Hollingshead, August B. 1957. Two Factor Index of Social Position 1965 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.
6. Lansing, John B., Gerald P. Ginsburg, and Kaisa Braaten. 1958. An Investigation of Response Error. The Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Illinois, Urbana.